REMARKS

Claims 16 has been amended. Claims 1-50 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 11-15, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Hidary et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,181).

Claim 1 recites a method directed to transmitting supplemental data files along with a video stream. The supplemental data files are formatted "in a graphical markup language", each having instructions for "rendering a <u>hyperlink</u> overlay on the video stream. An exemplary system provided by the recited method is shown and described in Fig. 3 and on page 13, starting at line 7 of the specification. As set forth in the specification:

An overlay window 200 is opened for displaying a hyperlink overlay. Video subsystem 66 is configured to display the video stream in a viewport 201 that coincides in size and position with the overlay window 200. The video subsystem is also configured to display the video stream only over those areas of the hyperlink overlay that are not set to the predetermined color key. Thus, non-transparent areas of the hyperlink overlay appear "through" the video stream, and appear to overlay the video stream. Perhaps the best example of this behavior is the TV weatherman who appears to "float" in front of a weather map. A frame window 202 is also utilized to define the edges of overlay window 200 and viewport 201. These three components are configured to appear as a single window to a user. Operating software is configured so that the user can resize and move the components as a single entity.

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25

2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Thus, the specification describes and illustrates but one way in which the hyperlink overlay is rendered on the video stream. Hidary, on the other hand, neither discloses nor suggests any such feature. Rather, Hidary discloses and teaches just the opposite. In making out the rejection, the Office submits that Hidary discloses formatting data files in a graphical markup language, where each file has an instruction for rendering a hyperlink overlay on the video stream. The Office cites to Hidary's Abstract for this support. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hidary sets forth, in its Abstract, the following:

A system for integrating video programming with the vast information resources of the Internet. A computer based system receives a video program with embedded uniform resource locators (URLs). The URLs, the effective addresses of locations or Web sites on the Internet, are interpreted by the system and direct the system to the Web site locations to retrieve related Web pages. Upon receipt of the Web pages by the system, the Web pages are synchronized to the video content for display. The video program signal can be displayed on a video window on a conventional personal computer screen. The actual retrieved Web pages are time stamped to also be displayed, on another portion of the display screen, when predetermined related video content is displayed in the video window. [Emphasis added]

Hidary does not disclose a method by which supplemental data files are formatted in a graphical markup language, each with instructions for rendering a hyperlink overlay on the video stream. Rather, the following excerpts from Hidary describe in more detail exactly what Hidary's method is about:

The system of the present invention, on the other hand, is a much more flexible, but less complex, system. First, the

actual Web pages are not forced into the very limited bandwidth of the vertical blanking interval (VBI). Instead, merely eight fields of line 21 of the VBI are used to deliver the relevant Internet Web page addresses to the PC. These addresses are called "uniform resource locators" (URLs). The system then directs the particular Web browser to retrieve the identified Web pages from the Internet. Upon receipt of the particular Web page(s), the system syncs the Web page(s) to the video signal, and at the appropriate times, presents the Web pages on one portion of the computer screen with the television video signal, shown in a window on another portion of the screen, and thus, provides the synergistic Internet and television experience. [Summary, column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 12, emphasis added].

After a video program is created, <u>uniform resource locators</u> are embedded, preferably, into the vertical blank interval of the video programming by the URL encoder 8, shown in FIG. 1. [Column 3, lines 55-58, emphasis added].

Preferably, the URLs have associated time stamps which indicate to the subscriber stations when, during the video program, to display the particular Web pages addressed by the URLs. The particular information in line 21 is not part of the visual part of the program, and thus, is not perceptible to the human eye, thereby making it ideal to send data information to the users. [Column 3, lines 64 – column 4, line 4, emphasis added].

The present invention can best be understood with reference to an example. A viewer can begin watching a musical video featuring a new band, for example. As the video is received by the PC 16, URLs are being extracted from the vertical blanking interval and are being interpreted by the client software. Upon direction and command, the JAVA enabled browser retrieves particular Web pages from Internet 20 Web sites identified in the URLs. These Web pages will then be displayed on the video screen at particular times. Thus, for example, while the viewer is watching the music video, biographical information on the band can also be displayed adjacently to the video window. [Column 5, line 60-column 6, line 11, emphasis added].

Summarizing the above excerpts, what Hidary discloses is a method by which URLs are embedded in multiple fields of the vertical blanking interval (VBI). Hidary's URLs are used to access Web pages via the Internet and, upon receipt, display those Web pages on a portion of a screen while a television video signal is shown in another window. Nowhere does Hidary disclose or suggest any method in which a supplemental data file is formatted in a graphical markup language with instructions for rendering a hyperlink overlay on a video stream. Rather, Hidary clarifies that the information that is retrieved from the embedded URL is displayed "adjacently to the video window." This, in point of fact, teaches directly away from the presently-claimed subject matter which recites, in pertinent part, that the supplemental data files have instructions for rendering a hyperlink overlay on the video stream.

Hidary neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-6, and 11-15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested by Hidary.

For example, claim 2 recites that the formatting step comprises formatting the supplemental data files in HTML. Since Hidary neither discloses nor suggests the use of supplemental data files as contemplated in claim 1 (i.e. each file having instructions for rendering a hyperlink overlay on the video stream), it is virtually impossible for it to disclose formatting such files in HTML. Accordingly, for this additional reason, claim 2 is allowable.

Claim 3 recites a further step of "transmitting timing specifications with the supplemental data files indicating times for displaying the hyperlink overlays." (emphasis added). In making out the rejection of claim 1, the Office contends that the hyperlink overlays are the same as Hidary's URLs. (See Office action, page 2, paragraph #1). The Office cites to Column 3, lines 60-67 of Hidary in support of its position that Hidary discloses the subject matter of this claim. passage does not disclose that Hidary's URLs are ever displayed. Rather, what is displayed are the Web pages that are referenced by the URLs. Specifically, in the cited passage Hidary states, "[T]he URLs have associated time stamps which indicate to the subscriber stations when, during the video program, to display the particular Web pages addressed by the URLs." Accordingly, the time stamps to which Hidary refers indicate when to display Web pages addressed by the embedded URLs, not the URLs themselves. Further, the displayed Web pages are not "hyperlink overlays", as described and claimed in Applicant's disclosure. Any URLs that Hidary does display, do not appear to be displayed in accordance with transmitted timing specifications. See, e.g. Column 5, lines 45-55, which discloses displaying URLs in a control panel after they have been broadcast and received by the computer. There appears to be only one condition attached to the display of these URLs—that the URL is received by the PC. Nowhere does Hidary disclose or suggest displaying these URLs pursuant to timing specifications. Moreover, these URLs are not displayed as "hyperlink overlays" they are displayed in a separate control panel that is not a hyperlink overlay, as contemplated in Applicant's disclosure. For all of these additional reasons, claim 3 is allowable.

25

24

23

Claim 5 recites additional steps of "receiving the video stream and accompanying supplemental data files, and displaying the hyperlink overlays in conjunction with the video stream." As Hidary does not disclose or suggest formatting supplemental data files as pointed out above, it is virtually impossible for it to disclose or suggest receiving any such video stream and data files and displaying hyperlink overlays in conjunction with the video stream. The Office cites to Hidary's Column 3, lines 61-67 in support of its rejection of this claim. This portion of Hidary has been discussed above where it is pointed out that Hidary in no way discloses or suggests a method in which supplemental data files have instructions for rendering hyperlink overlays on the video stream. Accordingly, for this additional reason, claim 5 is allowable.

Claims 11-15 depend from claim 5 and are allowable for all of the reasons set forth with respect to claim 5 and claim 1 from which they depend. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in the claims from which they depend, are neither shown nor suggested by Hidary.

Claims 40-43 recite a video broadcast system. Claim 40 specifically recites "a broadcast source that broadcasts a video stream and provides accompanying supplemental data files, each supplemental data file having instructions for rendering a hyperlink overlay on the video stream; [and] a receiver configured to receive the video stream and accompanying supplemental data files and to display the hyperlink overlays in conjunction with the video stream." Nowhere does Hidary disclose or suggest a broadcast system in which a broadcast source provides a video stream and accompanying supplemental data files each of which have instructions for rendering a hyperlink overlay "on" the

video stream. Rather, as pointed out above, Hidary discloses a system that teaches away from the presently-claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claim 40 is allowable.

Claims 41-43 depend from claim 40 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 40, are neither shown nor suggested by Hidary. Accordingly, these claims are allowable.

§103 Rejections

Claims 7-10, 16-39, and 44-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidary in view of King et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,621,428).

Claim 7 depends from claim 5 which in turn depends from claim 1. Claim 7 is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim and for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claims 5 and 1, are neither shown nor suggested by any of the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Claim 7 recites a method wherein "the formatting step comprises setting transparent areas of each hyperlink overlay to a key color; [and] the displaying step comprises displaying the video stream only in the areas of the hyperlink overlays that are set to a key color."

Hidary, as pointed out above, neither discloses nor suggests formatting supplemental data files in a graphical markup language where each file has instructions for rendering a hyperlink overlay on the recited video stream. Accordingly, the §103 rejection is deficient for at least this reason. In making out the rejection, the Office cites to King for its disclosure of color keying techniques. Color keying technology is not new. King simply discloses the use of color

18

22 23

24

25

21

keying technology to automatically align video data with a video window on a display screen. More specifically, King's method automatically aligns video data by storing a selected color key in a graphics memory circuit, storing a chroma key in a motion video memory circuit, and simultaneously controlling the graphics memory circuit to output graphic signals and the motion video memory circuit to output video signals. The graphics signals are then compared to a stored color key to detect when the color key is transmitted within the graphics signals. When there is a match, a color key detection signal is generated. The outputted video signals are compared with a stored chroma key to detect when the chroma key is When there is a match, a chroma key detection signal is then generated. A vertical and horizontal offset between the color key detection signal and the chroma key detection signal is then detected, and this offset is used to adjust the timing of the motion video memory circuit so that the color key detection signal and the chroma key detection signal occur substantially simultaneously. This offset is then stored for subsequent operation of the motion video memory circuit. The chroma key stored in the storage locations in the motion video memory circuit is then replaced with the video data to be displayed in the video window.

Given the deficiencies in Hidary as pointed out above, Applicant submits that nothing in King fills those deficiencies in a manner that would render claim 7 obvious. Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable.

Claim 8 depends from claim 5 which in turn depends from claim 1. Claim 8 is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim and for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claims 5 and 1, are neither shown nor suggested by any of the references of record, either singly or in

combination with one another. Claim 8 recites the subject matter of claim 7 and, in addition, recites that the "displaying step comprises launching an HTML-compatible browser to display the hyperlink overlays". For all of the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7, claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 5 which in turn depends from claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim and for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claims 5 and 1, are neither shown nor suggested by any of the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 16 recites a method and has been amended to *clarify* that the formatted HTML files have instructions for rendering the hyperlink pages <u>on a video stream</u>. Nothing in Hidary discloses or suggests any such feature. Rather, as pointed out above, Hidary renders nothing <u>on</u> a video stream. King discloses only the use of color keying for the specific purpose mentioned above. Nothing in these references, taken in combination, discloses or suggests any method in which HTML files are formatted with instructions for rendering hyperlink pages <u>on</u> a video stream. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 17-23 depend from claim 16 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 16, are neither shown nor suggested by any of the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 24 recites a method in which a video stream is received. One or more hyperlink pages are associated with the video stream and have transparent areas that are set to a key color. The hyperlink pages are displayed on a display.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

The video stream is displayed on the display in areas of displayed hyperlink pages that are set to a key color. Thus, this method recites displaying a video stream within areas of a hyperlink page. Nowhere does Hidary disclose or suggest any such method. In making out the rejection, the Office cites to column 5, lines 34-59 of Hidary for the proposition that "displaying the video stream only in the areas of the hyperlink pages" is disclosed. (See Office Action, page 6, top paragraph). Yet, as pointed out above, Hidary does not disclose displaying a video stream only in the areas of any hyperlink pages. See, e.g. Hidary, column 6, lines 8-10 which provides an example of what Hidary discloses ("Thus, for example, while the viewer is watching the music video, biographical information on the band can also be displayed adjacently to the video window.") Thus, it appears clear that what Hidary contemplates is <u>not</u> a method in which a video stream is displayed in areas of a displayed hyperlink page. Rather, Hidary discloses and teaches a method in which Web pages are display "adjacently" to the video window. King's disclosed color keying techniques add nothing of significance to the disclosure of Hidary that is clearly lacking. Accordingly, claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 25-31 depend from claim 24 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 24, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 32 is a claim directed to a computer-readable storage medium having instructions for performing steps that are the same as those set forth in claim 24. For all of the reasons set forth above with respect to the patentability of claim 24, this claim is allowable.

5

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

2324

25

Claims 33-39 depend from claim 32 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 32, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 44 depends from claim 40 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 40, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 45 recites a receiver for receiving and displaying video streams. The claim recites display hardware for displaying video streams and bit-mapped The display hardware is recited to include color keying images to a user. hardware that displays video in display areas that are set to a key color. Access means are recited for reading supplemental data files that have instructions for rendering bit-mapped hyperlink overlays in conjunction with the video stream at indicated times. A data processor is recited to read the supplemental data files and in response display the hyperlink overlays at the indicated times. The hyperlink overlays have transparent areas that are set to a key color thus appearing to overlay the video streams. Hidary, as pointed out above, does not disclose or suggest any such system in which any hyperlink overlays appear to overlay a video stream. Further, Hidary neither discloses nor suggests a system in which supplemental data files are read having instructions for rendering bit-mapped hyperlink overlays in conjunction with a video stream. Rather, Hidary provides a system in which Web pages are displayed beside or adjacent a video window. King discloses only

systems that use color key techniques to display video and graphics data. In combination, these references neither disclose nor suggest the subject matter of claim 45. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 46-50 depend from claim 45 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 45, are neither shown nor suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully request that the undersigned be contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 1/3/00

Lance R. Sadler

Reg. No. 38,605 (509) 324-9256